

# **Town of Bristol**

## **Focus Panel Report** *High-Volume Hydro-Fracturing*

Respectfully submitted to:

Bristol Town Board  
&  
Bristol Planning Board

April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary . . . . .	3
Brief Timeline of Bristol Focus Panel . . . . .	4-5
Results of High-Volume Hydrofracturing Survey completed by Bristol Town Residents . . . . .	5
Public Input <i>Opposed</i> to High-Volume Hydrofracturing in the Town of Bristol From: Bristol Town Board Meetings, Surveys, gmail and letters. . . . .	6-38
Public Input <i>In Favor</i> of High-Volume Hydrofracturing in the Town of Bristol From: Surveys, gmail and letters . . . . .	38-41
Public Input <i>Not Clear</i> in Terms of Opposition or Favoring Hydrofracking . . . . .	42
Focus Panel Recommendations to the Bristol Town Board & Planning Board . . . . .	43-44
Appendix A: New York State Environmental Law 23-0303 . . . . .	45
Appendix B: Charge Given to Focus Panel by Town Supervisor . . . . .	46
Appendix C: Letter to Residents.....	47
Appendix D: September 26 Presentation to Bristol Community.....	49

### Focus Panel Members:

Scott Battle  
Lon Chase  
Jude Ellis  
Nate Harvey  
Judi Taylor Salsburg  
Tom Stevens

### Town Board Members:

Alden Favro  
Bob Green  
Bruce Harter  
David Parsons  
Thomas Stevens

### Planning Board Members

Bob Drayn  
Nate Harvey  
Robert Raeman  
Joann Rogers  
Robert Stryker

## Executive Summary

- Bristol Focus Panel met for discussion, research, visits to high-volume hydrofracking sites, and other various tasks approximately 32 times from January of 2012 to the present date of April 8, 2013. (See “Timeline of Bristol Focus Panel” pp. 4-5)

- Bristol Focus Panel reports to residents concerning the positive and negative impacts of the current High-Volume Hydrofracking industry.

Topics included:

- History of natural gas in Bristol
- Gas extraction process
- Economic impacts
- Land use issues
- Truck traffic related to HVHF
- Water use
- Housing topics
- Environmental factors
- Public health and safety issues
- Bristol's Comprehensive Plan
- Potential tools available to municipalities

- Bristol Focus Panel provided several opportunities for residents' written commentary on this topic. Many residents also spoke at monthly Town Board meetings.

- Speakers: see Town Board Meeting minutes each month
- Some speakers submitted written copies of their comments
- Written gmail submissions
- Written survey comments
- Letters via USPS

### **Brief Timeline of Bristol Focus Panel**

**January 9, 2012:** Focus Panel was appointed by the Bristol Town Board. From the document "*Focus Group – Town of Bristol,*" submitted by Supervisor Green, "Their mission will be to objectively study available materials as it related to zoning structures and regulation based on current ECL laws' (Environmental Conservation Law) potential positive and negative impacts on the community. It is recommended that the focus group consider legislation and information from other communities that have or will be impacted by this technology (HVHF). It is incumbent upon the

focus group to ensure that recommendations are uniform, fair, objective, and consistent. The end result will be to make recommendations to the Town Board and Planning Boards for future zoning regulations as it related to the current industry.”

**February 7, 2012:** Panel’s first meeting.

**February 28, 2012:** Panel hosts open meeting at Bristol Fire Department in order to gather input about proposed High-Volume Hydrofracking moratorium. Also, Panel establishes electronic address to gather comments from community ([bristolfrackinformation@gmail.com](mailto:bristolfrackinformation@gmail.com)); address remains active.

**February 20 – Sept 25, 2012:** *Focus Panel meets approximately every other week.*

**March 12, 2012:** Bristol Town Board votes unanimously to accept moratorium, Local Law #1.

**April 4, 2012:** Some Focus Panel members attend Empire Energy Forum in Geneseo, NY.

**April 27, 2012:** Bristol Focus Panel travels to Bradford County, PA.

**May 21, 2012:** Some members of Focus Panel met with representative from Honeoye Storage, Corp.

**May 30, 2012:** Bristol Focus Panel collaborates with Richmond focus group to host Kim Sherwood, hydrologist and water planner for Chautauqua County, NY.

**May 16, 2012:** Bristol Focus Panel attends lecture given by IOGA representative Adam Schulz at South Bristol Town Hall.

**June 11, 2012:** Bristol Town Board votes unanimously to accept revised moratorium, Local Law #3.

**June 28, 2012:** Bristol Focus Panel and Richmond Focus Panel host Dr. Anthony Ingraffea, Civil and Environmental Engineering Professor, Cornell University.

**August 8, 2012:** Bristol Focus Panel sends letter (Appendix C) to all Bristol town residents and taxpayers, requesting citizens become informed about HVHF, informing the public about upcoming September 26 presentation, and alerting people of imminent survey. (See attached.)

**August 28, 2012:** Focus Panel travels to Dimock, PA, for tour and presentation by Cabot Oil.

**September 7, 2012:** Bristol Focus Panel sends reminder postcard notice about September 26 presentation.

**September 26, 2012:** Bristol Focus Panel reports to residents concerning the positive and negative impacts of current HVHF industry. Topics include: a brief history of natural gas in Bristol; cursory background about gas extraction process; economic impacts; land use issues; truck traffic related to HVHF; water use; housing topics; environmental factors; public health and safety issues; Bristol’s Comprehensive Plan; and potential tools available to municipalities. Also, residents were encouraged to complete a survey, also available on Town website, at Bristol Town Hall, and Bristol Library.

**October 15, 2012:** Deadline for survey submissions, Bristol Town Hall.

**November 8, 2012:** Survey results reported to Bristol Town Board: 179 usable surveys, results are below.

### **Results of High-Volume Hydrofracturing Survey of Town of Bristol Residents**

1091 letters were sent to Bristol residents and property owners informing them of the Focus Panel Presentation on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012. Surveys were made available at the presentation, as well as the Bristol Town Hall and Bristol Library from September 26<sup>th</sup> to October 15<sup>th</sup> 2012. Results in the chart below are based on 179 verified residents and property owners who turned in surveys.

Please Note: Not all questions were answered on each survey creating a discrepancy in the total number of answers:

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>
1) Familiar with Bristol Comprehensive Plan	<b>107</b>	71%	<b>43</b>	29%
2) Personal investigation on HVHF	<b>111</b>	72.5%	<b>42</b>	27.5%
3 Allow HVHF in Bristol	<b>13</b>	7.5%	<b>166</b>	92.5%
4) Ban HVHF in Bristol	<b>138</b>	90%	<b>15</b>	10%
5) Do not have an opinion about HVHF in Bristol	<b>16</b>	15%	<b>88</b>	85%
6) Learn more about HVHF in Bristol	<b>71</b>	50.3%	<b>70</b>	49.6%
7) Need more information before making an informed decision	<b>26</b>	19%	<b>111</b>	81%
8) Ontario County to adopt a uniform plan	<b>111</b>	84%	<b>21</b>	16%

### **Public Input *Opposed* to High-Volume Hydrofracturing in Bristol Presented at Town Board Meetings**

HVHF has been a topic, usually during the Privilege of the Floor, at almost every Town Board meeting since November 2011. Residents have come out in record numbers to make it clear to their Town Board that they are not in support of high-volume, hydraulic fracturing. **Record of some of these comments can be found in the Bristol Town Board minutes, November 2011 through February 2013.** Included here are the comments that residents submitted in writing, some of which

were letters to the board, and some were spoken at the meetings, with the request they be entered in the official minutes for that Town Board Meeting.

## October 2, 2012

Members of the Board, members of the Focus Panel, fellow residents:

Hi, my name is ----- and I live on ----- . I attended the meeting last week on High Volume Hydrofracking. I thank the members of the Focus Panel for all their hard work in gathering and presenting information about this important issue, and the Town Board for wisely taking this proactive initiative. I agree with you that all residents should be fully informed about this unconventional fracking method, because if it were to be approved, it would have a major impact on the town and everyone's lives.

Based on what I've learned, I want to share four serious concerns:

- 1) **Lack of local control:** The Gas Mining Statute in New York State takes away local control over anything related to fracking, with the exception of "local roads" and "real property tax law." Important factors such as how many wells may be dug, and where, would be out of the town's control, so it's an "all-or-nothing" situation. I think that is extremely important for everyone to know about.
- 2) **Compulsory Integration:** This means, basically, that if 60% of the land abutting my property is leased for fracking, I and my *non-leasing* neighbors will be *forced to join*, in order to complete a 640 acre site. The gas company would not have access to my property *above-ground*, but could do anything it wants to extract gas from *underneath* my land, my home, and my private well—without my consent. I would be forced to choose from three options of “ownership” and would have to go to Albany to attend a “Compulsory Integration Hearing.” Frankly, this kind of policy is hard to imagine here in the U.S. (Sounds more like something the former Soviet Union would do.)
- 3) **Risks to our water supply and water and air safety:** Literally millions of gallons of water per well are used to extract the gas from the shale. This may very well strain our area's water supply, especially considering the hot, dry summer we just had. If this is a trend, as scientists tell us, water conservation will become increasingly important. So we should not waste it on anything not crucial to our welfare, *and* do our utmost to protect its safety. However, during the fracking process, toxic chemicals are added to the water, and methane gets transferred from the shale. Dangerous chemicals and higher levels of methane may end up in our wells, as has happened in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. In view of this, and in view of unforeseen calamities that happen even with conventional mining operations, it is clear that water as well as air safety will be at risk. To me this is unconscionable, for ourselves and future generations—despite the temporary economic benefits fracking may bring to the town. Once those toxic chemicals are in the ground, they'll be there forever (remember Love Canal?). I have a son who was diagnosed with cancer at age 23. I don't wish that on anyone.
- 4) **Possible increase of earthquakes or tremors:** I don't believe the panel brought up the risk of

more, and more serious, earthquakes or tremors as a result of the fracking process. This has been made public by scientists and should definitely be taken into account as well.

Those are just four concerns; there are many others, including 24/7 truck traffic, noise and light pollution, road degradation, despoiling of the landscape, and declining property values. All of this is related to allowing heavy industry (that's how fracking is categorized) in our backyards—for the first time ever—and all of it goes against the Town of Bristol's mission statement and comprehensive plan.

Members of the Focus Panel, I hope you will continue to make your findings public, on the town's

website, for example, so all residents will be fully informed. Fellow residents, I urge you to make up your minds based on facts, not assumptions, and let the Town Board know where you stand by filling out and returning the survey forms provided. Members of the Town Board, please continue to be wise and proactive and ban this horrible monster from our beautiful town, forever! I will do all I can to help achieve this. Thank You.

### **Oct. 2, 2012**

I'm ----- I live on ----- . I thank the Focus Panel for their informative presentations last week.

I'm a scientist, and for more than 35 years, I conducted biomedical research using experimental animals at the U of R Medical Center. From what I've learned about high-volume hydrofracking, I have come to a shocking realization: It's much more difficult to get approval to conduct research on animals in a university lab than it is to conduct research on human beings in their towns and homes. If I want to study the effects of a potentially toxic substance on some physiological process in a mouse or a frog, my project must first receive approval from a University Committee on Animal Resources. Among the many questions I have to answer are: how do I justify the number of experimental animals I intend to use and will the experimental design I'm proposing allow me to gather new and meaningful information? In other words, can I assure the committee that I will not be "wasting" animals by having a protocol that is flawed? One such flaw would be repeating the same experiment multiple times using new animals each time before the results from the first experiment were known; this would be considered a misuse of animals. Furthermore, if my proposal involves using infectious agents, hazardous substances, or radioactive materials, I will also need to get approval from the Environmental Health and Safety Committee at the U of R. Only after I get approval from these internal groups, can I apply to an outside agency for money to do my research.

I mention all this because fracking is, in fact, a highly complex experimental procedure designed to profitably obtain natural gas from shale. As it turns out, many fracking experiments have been carried out before it was known what health risks would be assumed by folks living in the communities where the wells were being drilled. From a scientific viewpoint, this is a shocking oversight given the amount and number of toxic chemicals that are included in the mixture that is injected, under high pressure, into the ground. To name just a few: Benzene, formaldehyde, naphthalene, xylene, lead, and kerosene. A disturbing number of the chemicals used are known to cause cancer and/or to harm reproduction and normal development. In the flowback, radioactive compounds like radon, radium, and uranium are found as well. Over the life of a typical gas well, up to 100,000 gallons of chemicals may be injected into the ground together with millions of gallons of water, and if you consider that one single well pad can have 10 wells, that's 1 million gallons of chemicals, many of which are toxic for humans. I'm not even mentioning migration of methane to drinking water.

If we look at fracking as human experimentation, the experimental design that's been followed has serious flaws and as such would NOT have been approved by an impartial committee at any university in the country. The potential for health risks *should* have been obvious to the governmental agencies responsible for oversight. Instead, exemptions to the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Clean Water Act were granted so that fracking could proceed in a hurry.

Of course, in a valid scientific experiment, well after well would not have been dug in populated areas in different states before the long-term as well as the short-term effects of fracking were known. It may take years before benzene can cause cancer, for example. And ALL chemicals added to the fracking water would have been known, as would their effects on animals and humans. Sadly, such a solid cautious scientific approach has not been used, and more and more fracking wells have appeared in more and more states and more and more medical problems have been reported.

Ever since high volume hydraulic fracturing started, changes have had to be made continuously, because of failures of cement casings, storage facilities and waste treatment plants.

This is known as closing the barn door after the horses have left. I cannot predict what other changes in the process will need to take place because of newly discovered adverse outcomes of existing wells. I sure would like to know these possible outcomes now before they start drilling in Bristol. I do not want us to be guinea pigs, or at the very least, I would like these experiments on human beings to be subject to the same rules and regulations as experiments on guinea pigs. Ten or twenty years from now, as the full impact of fracking on health becomes known, will we be asking ourselves why didn't we stop this process earlier, and why for heaven's sake did we allow it in our town?

## December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012

At the November meeting I was impressed to hear that 92% of residents who filled out the survey solidly opposed high-volume hydrofracking. This significant outcome is in perfect alignment with our Mission Statement and Comprehensive Plan, which were constructed with residents' input. I'd like to quote the first five goals listed in the Comprehensive Plan:

1) *to improve the condition of the environment and protect it from degradation.*

That's top of the list!

2) *to preserve our rural character, protect our natural resources and maintain scenic vistas.*

That's number 2, and included in this section are these two statements:

- *"The residents of the Town of Bristol have indicated through opinion surveys in 1996 and in 2005 that maintaining the rural character and scenic vistas of our town were their biggest concern," and:*

- *"Scenic Vistas are Bristol's most important natural resource, and maintaining them should be a primary consideration in all aspects of development in our town."*

3) *to promote agriculture viability and protect the Town's agricultural land resources.*

Mentioned in this section is the following:

- *"Once farmland is developed, it is rarely, if ever, returned to farming. We only have a finite amount of land, and our hope is that this Comprehensive Plan will act as a tool for future planning."*

4) *to shape and improve the quality of life in the Town of Bristol through planned and managed growth.*

Specifically included in this section is the following statement:

- *"All Boards are required to reflect the goals of the Comprehensive Plan when updating the Town of Bristol Zoning Regulations and related local laws."*

5) *to encourage a stable and diverse economy and to promote businesses having a low impact while at the same time being complimentary to the protection of Bristol's and our neighboring towns' environment.*

Included in this section is this paragraph:

- *"Due to our relatively isolated location, industrial development may not be forthcoming to Bristol. However, this may be in our best interest by allowing us to focus and promote smaller business development such as technological, artisan and light industrial businesses."*

In the interest of time I won't go into the remaining goals, on topics like tourism, parks, and safe, environmentally responsible transportation and infrastructure. Let me just say this: ***Allowing high-volume hydrofracking in Bristol is simply not compatible with a single one of these goals.*** And let me restate this most important of quotes: ***"All Boards are required to reflect the goals of the***

***Comprehensive Plan when updating the Town of Bristol Zoning Regulations and related local laws.”***

In view of our current zoning which does not include heavy industry; our Comprehensive Plan, whose entire intent and wording aims to preserve this; and the 92% of survey respondents who oppose fracking, I would urge the Board to make sure the pristine, wholesome character of our town remains preserved. In fact, I would submit, with all due respect, that you have no other option but to **ban high-volume hydrofracking now** based on zoning regulations. Doing anything else, or waiting until it's too late, would clearly go against the express wishes of the vast majority of the residents whom you represent.

**February 11, 2013**

First off, I am a member of the Bristol Action Group. You can find us at Bristol Action Group/Facebook or email us at [bristolactiongroup@gmail.com](mailto:bristolactiongroup@gmail.com). I have to say, I put out signs reminding residents of tonight's meeting and I've had two signs on the corner of Oakmount and 20A stolen each time I put them out. It is time consuming and expensive to purchase and remake posters, so I thought handing out flyers might work better at the town dump. I am asking the board's approval tonight to do so. I have handed them out to each board member.

Two months ago at the Dec. TB meeting, many people expressed their need to start working on zoning restrictions to keep HVHF out of Bristol. Supervisor Green has stated numerous times that his biggest concern is the truck traffic. Pete Jones and I asked Bob Green if he would "get the ball rolling" and start with zoning laws that keep heavy industry truck traffic out of Bristol. We felt there was common ground that we can all agree on. Bob agreed and told Mr. Harvey, chairman of the Planning board, to go ahead and start the process at the next planning board meeting in January 2013. It has been two months and I have not seen anything in the planning board minutes nor any mention of it at the last board meeting and I would like you to explain what has been done so far.

As for the high volume wells in NYS, I honestly don't see why that matters if they were done before the state moratorium or not. We need to focus on what Bristol residents want and from the survey, they do not want HVHF or any other heavy industry in Bristol. It is just too industrialized for this area. I hope we can put an end to this conversation about wells in the state and bring the focus back to Bristol. Can you please give us an outline how this board is going to keep heavy industry out of our town? You can comment now and please add the answers to those questions on your website with this attachment. Thank you.

**February 11, 2013**

My comments will refer to fracking. By that I mean unconventional high volume hydraulic fracturing which has never been done, or even permitted, anywhere in New York State.

My wife's recent open letter to Andrew Cuomo published in the Daily Messenger spoke about the Governor's legacy with respect to fracking. It starting me thinking about Bristol and the legacy of each of the members of our Town Board.

What will your legacy be, Bob Green, Alden Favro, David Parsons, Bruce Harter, and Thomas Stevens?

Will you be remembered as the town board member who ignored the 92 percent of residents who responded to a survey with a resounding NO to fracking? Or will you be the one who heeded the clear wishes of the community that elected you to your important position?

Will you be remembered as the town board member who literally rewrote the town's mission statement, comprehensive plan, and zoning regulations to permit destructive heavy industry in our rural community? Or will you be the one who strengthened our zoning laws in order to preserve the pristine and healthy environment of our community?

Will you be remembered as the town board member who permitted our roads to be stressed and damaged by heavy truck traffic, 24/7, in winter and summer? Or will you be the one who voted to safely maintain our rural roads within our clean, tranquil environment?

Will you be remembered as the town board member who allowed the influx of transient workers, new bars, increased crime, and skyrocketing rents that forced current residents out of their rented homes? Or will you be the one who supported carefully planned growth and increased recreational opportunities for those who were born here or have chosen to live here because they love this place?

Will you be remembered as the town board member who risked having toxic chemicals and radioactive waste spilled in our fields and waterways? Or will you be the one that was wise enough to promote the preservation of our precious water and our agricultural lands?

Will you be remembered as the town board member who permitted just a few landowners to earn money from leasing their land at the expense of their neighbors' health, the marketability of their produce, milk or cattle, and the value and insurability of their homes? Or will you be the one who took a stand to protect the health and welfare of the entire community?

Members of the Board, this is a crucial time in the history of Bristol, NY. Bob Green, Alden Favro, David Parsons, Bruce Harter and Thomas Stevens, please think long and hard about your role in writing this history because it will be your legacy. The choice is yours, each of yours, and yours alone.

### **Public Input *Opposed* to High-Volume Hydrofracking Written Comments from the Surveys**

1. No fracking in Bristol or anywhere else.
2. We would need water lines first before town considers anything that could spoil our water!!!
3. No fracking please
4. No fracking in Bristol.

5. I would like the state to ban HVHF! The town needs to use their zoning authority to enact laws and ordinances addressing HVHF to protect our current comprehensive plan.
5. Ban high volume hydraulic fracking without exception!
6. I would like HVHF banned in the town of Bristol.
7. I believe this gas extraction will be more detrimental in the long run. There are too many faults and fractures naturally occurring to assume there would be no issues from HVHF. Now that I have learned about hydro fracturing with chemical additives, I feel the residents need to watch their water supplies very closely. I would be in favor of having gas companies who have done vertical pay for the well testing. The town needs to keep its citizens safe.
8. I have studied this issue extensively, and I am convinced that high volume hydraulic fracturing would be a true calamity for Bristol. I feel very passionately about this. The environmental degradation, damaging truck traffic on local roads, infiltration of the water supply, destruction of property values that are apparent in Pennsylvania, all make me do whatever is necessary to protect the local ecosystem and community. A few people get rich in the short run, but what about the rest of us who live here? What about the future generations have to live with the destruction? Please do not allow fracking in our community!!
9. I feel that "fracking" is a risk to the Finger Lakes region. Fracking is a risk to tourism in the Finger Lakes.
10. How could anyone do this to this beautiful land...just for the almighty buck?! I don't have children to leave this land to but we do have a responsibility to the next generation...don't you think?
11. Since the Marcellus Shale in our area is not deep enough or thick enough for Hydrofracking it appears this would not be a suitable area for gas exploration using that method. As a taxpayer, I would not like the heavy equipment destroying our roads, so if there is a remote possibility of fracking in this area, perhaps new zoning to protect our roads is necessary. Taxpayers should not have to bear the cost of repairing roads destroyed by heavy equipment.
12. I don't want my water polluted.
13. I think that the only people in favor of hydraulic fracturing are the ones who think they're going to make a lot of money. I also don't think you can put a price on the damage it will do to our environment. What about our children and the mess that will be left behind for them? We live in a beautiful area, I for one would like to leave it like that for generations to come. I think hydro fraking is driven by greed and nothing more.
14. We just don't want it here.
15. Heavy Industry is inconsistent with Bristol Town Mission statement/Master Plan.
16. I feel that all neighboring towns and counties need to get together and be on same page so that this HVHF stays out of our area.

17. Our natural resources are too valuable to risk for short term gains, that may or may not benefit only a few local residents. I can't believe anyone would want this. Why are we talking about this if we are north of the no drill line? Why are Hemlock and Canadice Lakes not shown as protected No Drill areas? Haven't we learned the price paid for greed. If HVHF is heavy industry why is it not controlled with zoning? I see HVHF as inconsistent and actually adverse to the goals of the Bristol Comprehensive Plan.

18. I would not want the decision for Bristol to depend on uniformity across the county. I think Bristol has its own issues to consider, and feel the town and town's people are putting a lot time and thought into it. Not all towns may do that. I don't think I want to learn how HVHF will be done in Bristol. I'm happy to learn more about HVHF and have the learning done in Bristol – not the fracking.

19. If hydrofracking comes to Bristol I will move. If the Town Board wants to stick to the Comprehensive Plan then they should not even consider HVHF in Bristol.

22. We can't drink money; I feel there should be safe ways of extracting. Our mission statement states to preserve our rural environment ( How will this be possible when so many trucks will be traveling in & out of our community?)

23. The limited possibilities of both the Marcellus and the Utica shale deposits preclude further development in the foreseeable future. The Marcellus is too shallow and the Utica is too thin in this area. Unless technology changes, I would recommend limited changes in regulation but on going reappraisal and preparation to act when necessary.

24. The risk is too high.

25. I am willing and eager to continue to learn however at this time we do not favor it.

26. The environmental, cultural and long-term unknown effects of HVHF far outweigh the short-term monetary gains of HVHF. Most of the monetary gains will go to transient workers and big oil and gas companies. Land leases hold their residents prisoners because their property values plummet so hard. If HVHF is allowed in Bristol or the surrounding towns it . . . ***this sentence was continued on the back of the survey but cannot be completed due to the fact that the tops of the surveys were cut off and two or three sentences of commentary were lost . . . the commentary continues with:*** I've personally seen how towns have changed over the years. My husband and I will probably leave New York and move to Massachusetts if HVHF is allowed in this area. We don't want to live with the threat of well (water) pollution, truck traffic and heavy industry in our backyards. Fracking is the absolute worst thing the Town of Bristol, or any of the surrounding towns could do to their heritage and residents, the damage done by fracking could never be undone. Fracking is so new, no one knows the long term effects and if that 70% to 80% of brine left in the ground will come back up through our aquifers. The short-term pollution experienced in PA, OH, TX, CO, ND, SD, etc should be enough to scare everyone away from fracking! Protect our town!

27. I would like to see all of Ontario County ban this process. Where are the 620 acres available in Bristol, what is the water source available? I understand the importance of natural gas usage but not at the destruction of the environment. If it is believed that there is more natural gas in the area, why can't they drill normal vertical wells if this is less invasive?

[*Presentation:*] Very informative, very realistic. It was easy to understand. Thank you for the time and effort put in by all to help residents understand this process.

28. The damage to the land would far outweigh the monetary gains. The drilling companies don't care about the people who live in the surrounding areas. The amount of pollution that would be given off by the diesel equipment alone would be ridiculous. Keep Bristol beautiful as it is. We don't need this or want this!

29. This area is starting to grow tremendously in Agri. and Eco Tourism because of its beauty and plentiful natural resources. All of the "side effects" of Hydrofracking will destroy this much more desirable and long lasting revenue!

[*Presentation:*] good and knowledgeable information

30. Not worth the risk. We can fix roads, land, but not water. Moving a high volume of traffic on RTE 64 would paralyze the town. Environmental issues not clear. Health issues not clear.

31. [*In regard to uniform Ontario County plan:*] Only if it is against hydrofracking. Please do not allow this. It goes against everything the town purports to hold dear about our lovely town.

32. Our beloved Bristol and all its wildlife will never be the same if HV fracking is allowed.

[*Presentation:*] Thank you! for all that you did to get the info. we needed.

33. I am very concerned that fracking would change what is so special about Bristol. If I wanted to live in an industrial area, I would have moved elsewhere. We selected Bristol for its quiet rural location to raise a family and enjoy nature.

34. [*In regard to Ontario County uniform plan:*] against this wasteful technique  
Evidence shows pollution, destruction of environmental beauty, many truck, noise, wear and tear on roads and where does the waste go? It's time to think about the future, use what nature gave us, wind, water, sun! Haven't we destroyed enough of the beautiful planet? Who monitors the site over time? Who pays for that? NOT IN OUR BACK YARD! If it comes here I shall move out! The gain of low percentage of gas is lost to the energy and gas and water used to create the site.

35. I do not want to ban hydrofracking for good but would like to restrict the trucks with excessive weight from traveling our roads. I think that this hydrofracking issue would be unattractive to companies wanting to do so if the cost of moving their trucks is prohibitive to making a profit. We cannot sustain excessive damage to our roads from the kind of traffic and weight from their heavy trucks.

36. PLEASE NO HYDROFRACKING IN BRISTOL VALLEY

37. Honeoye Gas Storage area covers almost all of northern Bristol. (40-50 square miles) Will hydraulic fracturing be allowed in this area? What are the chemicals going into the ground during fracking? [*clarification: this resident supported a ban*]

38. I would require, by any permits are issued in NY State, that prospective oil co. make known any chemical they are putting in the ground and submit samples to an independent group[ to do a health

and safety check. They should also be made responsible for any visual or damaging process to the area. ie. any road damage, slag or sludge as well as any contaminations to the Bristol area. They should also guarantee that this gas will be made available to the Bristol homeowners. Not like the wind farms where all power is going to suburban areas. [*clarification: this resident supported a ban*]

39. I do not want high volume hydraulic fracturing done in Bristol EVER.

40. The damage to land/property would be bad but the potential for the damage it could do to residents in the long run is horrible.

41. I do not want high volume hydraulic fracturing in our area. I feel it has not been proven safe for my water or my health. I feel with all the government level budget cuts, there will be enough oversight of the process.

[*Presentation:*] I feel the presentation was very informative. I appreciate all the time & energy the members put into the presentation.

42. Most of the hype has been about the environmental impact of HVHF, and that is certainly a valid concern, especially for a town with so many drinking water wells. However, what really scares me about HVHF is the big business “boom town” aspect of the prospect. How could anyone that sees what’s happening in PA make any sense here in the context of the town’s mission statement? Most of us chose to live here for the natural, peaceful surroundings. I don’t want to live in a gigantic perpetual construction zone. To me, the cons far outweigh the pros. In fact, I don’t see many of the “pros” as actual benefits for us.

[*Presentation:*] Excellent presentation. I really appreciate the panel’s efforts. I’m glad the Town of Bristol is being proactive.

43. [*On the front side of the following survey, the residents stated, “our comments are on the back;” the comments are typed in a single-spaced format, so approximately one half (or more) of the residents’ commentary has been lost due to cutting off the tops of the surveys. Below is the remainder of what they wrote.*]

... getting into our drinking water has to be considered. Common sense tells you if you pour into the ground gallons and gallons of treated water some of it has to remain and eventually it may find its way into the aquifer. It would be best if the county could adopt a uniform plan but because Bristol’s residents rely on wells for the drinking water we have to be extra vigilant. Our little town has to consider the extra cost of road maintenance also. A high volume of heavy truck traffic would make it even harder than it is to keep up with road repairs etc.

**Note: Out of 19 surveys with commentary, 3 surveys, (representing 4 residents), were incomplete due to the tops being cut off.**

44. I am interested in forming a uniform plan amongst Ontario county towns. However, it should not delay or restrict any actions of our own to ban fracking.

45. The serenity and beauty of Bristol must be protected for the generations which follow us. We have a duty to protect our environment and homes from high volume hydraulic fracking in Bristol.

46. There have been problems in many states. Once there is contamination there are no plans in place to correct it. The risk is too high. There are no benefits to most of the people. Our water, beautiful area, peace and quiet, and homes are far too valuable to risk.

47. NO to HVHF! EVER, ANYWHERE! I am all for a uniform plan (county wide) if it is to ban HVHF. If a uniform plan is to allow it, I am against that.

48. I do not feel that high volume hydraulic fracturing would be in the best interest for the Town of Bristol. The requirements necessary would change the area forever. The unknown consequences (long term effects) on our health, and those to come after, give great reason to be cautious.

49. I'm afraid fracking is a given for NYS., but I would hope strict laws are put in place and vigilantly enforced by the DEC to protect our water, our air, our health, and our way of life. Greed is the root of much evil and the big oil companies know no limits in that area.

50. Keep Bristol the way it is!

51. I totally oppose hydrofracking in Bristol, or anywhere for that matter. I have read up on the process and am against it. Environmental issues, health issues, traffic in excess on the roads, property destruction- these are just a few of the many concerns I have. There is no amount of money that could be offered to make me change my mind. I have always lived in the country, and when I moved to Canandaigua area 27 years ago, my husband and I chose Bristol to build our "forever" home due to the beautiful country setting. I am proud to tell people I live in Bristol, N.Y. , and I want it to remain the way it is- a beautiful, rural, country setting. I am a nature and wild life lover, and that is why I live here. So please, let's keep it in its natural beauty!

52. Unfortunately, I believe that no group of individuals nor towns has any influence regarding "Big Oil". Despite all their rhetoric about safety and protecting our environment, their bottom line is dollars and nothing will prevent them from running over people and property to accomplish it. I pray that I am wrong and that our grandkids will be blessed by the beauty and relative safety of our land.

53. Being an agricultural and recreational area, anything that jeopardizes our water sources is insane.

54. One only needs to read Bristol's mission statement. Don't allow a few to plunder the land and profit at the expense of all others.

55. Because I have seen first hand in my parents hometown of Williamsport and Jersey Shore, PA how this has changed everything about the environment, I am extremely concerned for our and the surrounding communities. Whenever we went down to PA to visit, it had always felt to me like going back in time, as though time had stood still. That was comforting to me. And seeing how all that was changed when "fracking" came in was devastating. My 2<sup>nd</sup> cousin who has always been a big fisherman, fishing all over in rivers, lakes and high mountain streams said that a lot of those waters that had always been plentiful of fish were now nearly barren. That in itself is an indication of how the water quality has been affected. I can only hope that we won't see that happen here.

56. While I believe residents should be able to be allowed to do what they want with their properties, when the decisions that they make can adversely impact other residents, then those actions should be reviewed. In the case of HVHF, many are impacted in various ways and as such, should be reviewed (as it is) to obtain the input from the residents. I don't know with certainty all the costs but HVHF seems as though it will benefit a few and negatively impact many.

57. I moved to my cabin in 1985 for peace and quiet and nature-I do not own as an investment but as a Home so therefore, I do not want development of any kind be it smelly blacktop roads, large pretentious houses or large trucks of any kind. Extra people are stressful and highly annoying-no amount of money is worth the ruin.

58. Do Not Want!

59. No one has the right to poison my family's water or air.

60. High Volume Hydrofracking is completely unacceptable and should not be allowed in Bristol!

61. High Volume Hydrofracking is unacceptable- Landowners who lease their mineral rights should have to bear liability for damages. No one has the right to poison my Family's water and air. Not to mention the degradation of the natural environment HVFracking is totally unacceptable!

62. Fracking=Poison Don't Destroy This Area and Its Beauty

63. My family has come to enjoy the peace and quiet we found in this wonderful area. I feel that HVHF would ruin the land and the town for our future and our children. I have personally experienced the impact that HVHF has had on towns in Pennsylvania, and feel that the current conditions are very negative. We would rather travel and recreate in areas that are not drilling.

64. Not enough information. I believe it's a short-term gain with many risk that could impact this area for many years to come. The plan should be regional, not towns, because of concerns with regional effects that would happen.

65. The sooner it is banned the better it is for all town residents!

66. My primary concern is with the safety, as it relates to ground water contamination. When I see the Governor immediately ban drilling in the NYC watershed, that tells me that they (Government) believe that there is a high probability of contamination. I believe that the protection of ground water in the town of Bristol is just as important as the water that is supplied to NYC and we deserve the same protections! Most of my neighbors have wells that are less than 30' deep and are very concerned (as they should be) about contamination.

67. Instead of short term gain, we need to be thinking of the next hundred or thousand years or longer. Chemicals pumped into the ground will eventually start moving into cracks and cervices. This will be a catastrophe for the entire region and our rich water resources. There would be no way to remediate this. We need a ban!

68. I feel that there are still too many unknowns about flowback and what stays in the well that could jeopardize our environment. Our water is far too valuable to jeopardize. The quality of life and the cost to our community by truck traffic, rental increases, and crime are not prices I would like to see our community to pay for. Please vote against hydrofracking in our area and make laws regarding land use unattractive to this industry.

69. First of all I want to thank you for a very informative presentation tonight. I appreciated the tone of the meeting, the impartial approach and the orderly control of the entire meeting. My wife and I have been to a number of presentations on hydro-fracking and feel strongly that the dangers far

outweigh the benefits in our area. Fresh, clean water will soon become our most valuable resource and any threat to that source must be reduced, The experimental nature of this process proves its potential for failure and contamination of our land. I don't believe the health issues have been fully explored due to the newness of the process. We strongly oppose hydrofracking in all of NYS and particularly in the area of Bristol.

70. The Finger Lakes Region is an absolute treasure in our state and we are blessed to live in Bristol. It seems to me that HVHF can only cause harm and should have no place here, ever.

71. I am very concerned about the chemicals (flowback water) that are pushed into the water. Is it safe for drinking? And what will it do to neighbors' water as well! It will be too big of a cost and burden for our community and spoil the scenic beauty of our state lands. Higher cost for road maintenance and tax burdens.

72. I feel that the fact that they don't have to meet the Clean Water Act standards alone is enough to outlaw the practice nationwide. I have seen what it has done to states such as Wyoming, and know that the companies involved do not have my best interest in mind.

73. It is my fact-based opinion that allowing fracking in our Beautiful Bristol would be disastrous-and entirely against our town's comprehensive plan. Although (probably short term) gains may be possible (economically) in the long run the character and health of our town and its pristine setting will be left with irreversible scars. Please think of the town's interests in the long run. Raise my taxes, if you must, but do not allow fracking to divide/destroy our community!

74. Dear Focus Panel and Town Board:

I first want to thank the Focus Panel and its members and the Town Board for the undertaking what is in many ways a thankless task. I know that each of you have invested substantial time and energy in investigating this matter from traveling to Pennsylvania, attending various lectures, reviewing articles, attending numerous meetings, etc. I know that each of you have, at heart, the best interest of our Town.

I am sure that we all agree that the Town's decision concerning slick water high volume hydrofracking is a critical decision that will affect the basic fabric of our community and what Bristol will be like in the decades to come and that this decision has implications that go far beyond any typical decision made by any Town Board.

My wife and I are opposed to slick water high volume hydrofracking for the reasons set forth below. I would have attended the Focus Panel's September 26th meeting but September 26 was {a day} I was unavailable.

I am attaching hereto the Survey of Town of Bristol Residents filled out by myself and my wife.

My wife and I own approximately 50 acres and a year round home at \_\_\_\_\_. We have owned the property since 1986 and have made significant improvements to our property over the years including making what was a seasonal home into a year round residence.

Although at present our primary home is in Canandaigua, we use the \_\_\_\_\_ property often and hope to live there a substantial part of the year when I retire. Although we have owned the

property for over 25 years, we bought the property from my best friend's parents and as a child I had many sleep overs at the property and therefore I have enjoyed this property for over 50 years.

Like many of you I have attended various lectures on slick water high volume hydrofracking. Also, \_\_\_\_\_ I have read various legal articles on the subject and followed the recent New York court cases upholding a municipality's right to control land use within its jurisdiction. As you know, these cases are now on appeal. It is also worth noting that the oil and gas industry in regard to slick water high volume hydrofracking is and has been in constant litigation with land owners, municipalities and the regulatory agencies that govern it in all states that this process exists.

Slick water high volume hydrofracking is obviously a complex issue and there are strong emotions on all sides of the issues. The foregoing notwithstanding I think certain factors cannot be seriously disputed.

1. Slick water high volume hydrofracking is a new technology that evolved approximately 6 years ago. As you know it involves millions of gallons of fresh water with thousands of gallons and other additives being pumped under high pressure into the ground along laterals stretching hundreds if not thousands of feet. The migration of these chemicals and additives is and has been an ongoing problem in the industry. There are those that want to compare slick water high volume hydrofracking to what Honeoye Gas and Storage has been doing in Bristol for years. Obviously, any comparison simply does not hold up to any serious scrutiny.

2. Unlike any other industrial development, the natural gas industry does not and cannot for efficiency reasons, be limited to a set industrial zone. The gas industry needs to be about and among where we live. Picture slick water high volume hydrofracking sites on South Hill Road, Elm Tree Road, or any road that you now live on. This "need" to be in our residential and rural areas is unique to this industry and it is one of the things that makes its impact so substantial.

3. Waste water from the drilling sites is toxic and hazardous. No one denies this. Many, if not all NYS communities refuse to receive it in its water treatment plants because it cannot be safely cleaned and put back into our water system. What does this truly say about what slick water hydrofracking really is when even our waste water treatment plants refuse to take its waste water because they can't treat it to make it safe enough to put back into our environment.

4. A significant percentage of the chemicals pumped into the ground are not recovered. Waste water that is recovered will be spilled at the drilling sites, leak from holding ponds, be spilled on the roads during transports, etc. There is simply no question that our water will be tainted. The only question is the extent of that damage and when will we know the full nature and extent of the impact. Damage caused by surface spills will be known immediately. Damage caused by underground spills and unrecovered fluids will not be known for years. In Pennsylvania wells have been and are being contaminated. The industry has a history of settling these claims with confidentiality agreement so they are not generally of public notice. The question is why would we want to expose our water supply to this contamination. In the future the world will be fighting over fresh water, not natural gas. There is no substitute for fresh water. There are substitutes for natural gas. Lets assume for a moment that instead of there being a certainty of fresh water contamination, there is "only" a risk of that happening. Is that risk worth taking at this time, under the present circumstances, with all the other negative impacts of this industry?

5. One of the arguments for slick water high volume hydrofracking is that we need the natural gas now for our national security. This is simply not true. Natural gas is presently a glut on the market. The excess supply rather than being saved for our future is being sold in foreign markets. Therefore, for our long term security any natural gas that may be under our community would be best left in the ground for the future needs of our country.

6. The gas industry, once you let them into our community, will do basically as it pleases and will ignore what rules and regulations are in place against it. It has the money and the history of first fighting and then simply paying fines for its violations as it is cheaper than adhering to the laws. It will threaten and engage the Town and any private citizens in endless litigation knowing full well that it has a much deeper pocket than any individual Town has. It has and will deny, deny, and deny that it has done anything wrong, that it has polluted our water, damaged our roads, or caused harm to our children, etc. Just think of the cigarette industry. How many decades did it deny any link between smoking and cancer. How many lawsuits did it fight, etc. The gas industry is no different. Its ads are warm and fuzzy but the facts simply do not support its public relations.

7. Truck traffic on our secondary and tertiary roads will be significant and at all hours of the day and night and during all seasons. Picture tractor trailers on our secondary and tertiary roads during icy and snowy conditions. Accidents will happen. Chemicals will be spilled. People will be hurt. Our secondary and tertiary roads and our hilly topography are simply not designed for the type of use or traffic.

8. Land values will be affected. No one will want to buy a property at or near a drilling site. Banks will not loan money on property at or near drilling sites. Would you buy near such a site, especially, here in Bristol where we are all on well water. I am sure that real estate attorneys will start adding to real estate contracts harmless clauses and other legal language requiring the seller to be forever responsible if water contamination is an issue in the future and certifying that there has never been slick water high volume hydrofracking on, under or near their property. Keep in mind that the horizontal laterals from this process go for 100s of feet underground. Sophisticated water tests will be required for all sales.

9. The insurance industry has started to deny coverage to property at or near drilling sites. Without insurance, banks will not loan money, your property will be un-saleable.

10. Some jobs will be created, but many will be filled by people who follow the gas industry from State to State. These will be temporary transient residents with no long-term stake or interest in our community. Is this the type of resident we want?

11. There will be light and noise pollution from the drilling sites from the drilling, the compressors, the truck traffic, etc.

12. The drilling experience in Pennsylvania and elsewhere shows that 5% of the wells fail from the start and more fail over time. The toxic drilling mixture will enter our water supply. Our well water will be impacted. Like many toxic chemical exposures, the effect will not necessarily be noticed immediately but will be cumulative over the years. The industry has and will obviously deny any responsibility. The impact of this industry will be felt for decades and long after the industry has moved on to the next "new" find.

13. The gas industry while its PR is touting its good citizenship, has lobbied for and received exemptions for pure waters legislation and other protective rules and regulations. It has fought and continues to fight any attempt to regulate it. It has and continues to ignore regulations intended to protect us. I would further note that in Pennsylvania one of the problems is that the State doesn't have enough inspectors to inspect all of the drill sites, so many sites go unchecked, unsupervised, and uninspected. The State relies in part on the gas industry self-regulating itself. With all due respect to the gas industry, self-regulation is not a serious option.

14. I think everyone agrees that science and technology will come up with a better, safer and cleaner way to extract natural gas that may be under Bristol. Given that we don't need the natural gas now and that science and technology will certainly come up with a better, safer and cleaner way to extract any such gas in the future, why would we want to allow slick water high volume hydrofracking in our community now. When the time is right, when the need is truly present and when the science and technology are safer we can revisit this issue.

15. Ontario County is at the northern most edge of the Marcellus Shale. This is not an area in which one expects to find long lasting good producing wells. Wells will be refracked. Wells will be abandoned.

16. It appears that all the surrounding municipalities have or are going to have to have in place protective land use planning legislation.

17. The gas industry touts the increase in revenue that a township will see. Any increase in revenue will be more than offset by an increase in municipal expenses and a decrease in land values that will go on long after the industry moves on to the next "big" find.

18. Certainly a small number of landowners may make some money but even this will be offset by a decrease in their land values and at a very significant cost to the community at large.

One could go on with the impacts both large and small of slick water high volume hydrofracking but suffice it to say that slick water high volume hydrofracking will be a game changer in any community that allows it. There will be no going back. There will be no chance to rethink any decision to allow this industry in our town.

In conclusion, at this time there does not appear to be any credible reason to allow slick water high volume hydrofracking into our community. The Country doesn't need extra gas production. Our community doesn't need to and shouldn't take the gamble that our most important and irreplaceable resource, clean water, (not to mention our peace and quiet and natural beauty) will be tainted.

The question is why would we do that? For what? So that a very few number of people may benefit financially for a short term.

We literally live in paradise. We are among the fortunate people in the world. We have clean air, clean water, beautiful rolling hills, serenity. Why would we put that on the table for at most a short term financial benefit for a few. We are the Saudi Arabia of clean water. It is this resource and not natural gas that people will be paying dearly for in the future.

In conclusion, the tag line to Joni Mitchell's 1960's song "Paved Paradise" is relevant. "Don't it always seem to go that you don't know what you got 'til its gone. They paved paradise and put up a parking lot." Do we really want to allow the oil and gas industry to "frack" paradise.

Again, my wife and I thank you for all the efforts you all have made in regard to this issue.

## **Public Input *Opposed* to High-Volume Hydrofracking from the Bristol Town gmail**

Within one week after the first meeting on February 7, 2012, the Bristol Focus Panel encouraged comments in writing. Residents could submit viewpoints through the United States Postal Service or through an electronic account created specifically for Bristol residents' input. On this g-mail account, many citizens submitted information they deemed valuable. (Because this is a free site, there are some unrelated messages and a petition opposing fracking. The petition has not been recorded in this report.) On this e-mail address, citizens also freely contributed their comments. Some of those comments are "cut and pasted" directly from their electronic notes. An excerpt may indicate that certain statements might be taken out of context, but these comments are the whole or part of a letter to the Focus Panel expressing a clear view opposing hydrofracking. Well over forty comments from Bristol citizens reflect a strong opinion against fracking. On the following pages are the comments opposed to HVHF.

On this g-mail account, two people have contributed their views expressing their support of high-volume, hydraulic fracturing. Both of these comments are copied in whole, with edits only to keep the person's personal information confidential:

### **February - April 2012:**

Several comments specifically regarding suggestions about the moratorium are not included in this report since these suggestions were incorporated by the Focus Panel in the revised moratorium, which became Local Law #3.

**March 1, 2012:** Rather than go over what I personally think of high volume hydrofracking I thought I would send you links to some of the articles I have read that have brought me to my anti-fracking stance. I really feel that there is not enough evidence that is truly safe to go ahead and allow it. This [PA game-changer](#) was very interesting as it show 2 sides to the hydrofracking issue by 2 college professors from Pennsylvania and then this one from [2 groups of Cornell Professors](#). These guys are way smarter than I am and they can't agree on the dangers.

The last state review of oil and gas exploration, production and waste management for NY was done in 1994 when high volume hydro fracking was NOT really a consideration.

It seems a poorly done well could still allow liquid material from one rock layer to get to another. Any well bore is a potential pathway to polluting our water. According to my ex-husband ( who has been an independent consultant in the oil and gas industry since 1975) the casing for gas exploration is nothing like a casing for a water well drilled for a house down to 200 to 300 feet. The pressures and procedures are totally different. Gas drilling is not an open hole. As drilling occurs they use mud (slurry of clay and water {and chemicals for high volume} that equalizes the head pressures (static head = 2.3 ft of elevation = 1 psi) with the weight of the mud and it is adjusted to maintain an equilibrium between the annulus (outside OD of drill pipe and the wall of the well) and the pressures within the rock/gas. Gas/sometimes in liquefied form depending on the pressure from the earth and

depth exerts a constant pressure until a pressure relief exists, in this case a drilled hole. That is why after the completion of a successful exploratory well it gets turned into a production well, gas (and other stuff like sulphides) will migrate to the relief hole (in this case the well) and go upwards under its own pressure. This is done by removing or drilling through plugs (sometimes concrete) that were installed as part of the casing job to stop the gas from flowing. I don't really understand all the technical aspects but someone on the advisory or town board will.

A casing job occurs in stages/segments as they continue to drill deeper. Once a section is cased, the annulus is sealed usually with concrete. During this casing procedure, sealing devices are installed at the bottom of the drill pipe sometimes called a shoe, something like a foot valve in reverse on a water well, which stops the higher pressures in the earth from coming up through the drill pipe but allows the mud to flow out the bottom of the pipe and up through the annulus which maintains the pressure equilibrium.

If this casing job was not done properly at the point where the drill pipe goes through the aquifer, contamination can and will occur. Remember, a man-made pressure relief was just added to the aquifer by the drill pipe. The static and dynamic pressures from the earth/well will pass through the failed casing joint (where the annulus was not sealed properly) and enter the aquifer along with anything else that flows with it. Nature abhors a vacuum; pressure will flow from the high to the low to reach equilibrium. During the casing job while allowing the concrete to set up, the driller should monitor the flow returns of the sealing substance which is mud/slurry mix of clay and water usually. If the seal job was done improperly the pressure will relieve someplace. The wells that are 5,000 feet down, create a static head of 2,139 PSI, plus any natural pressure from the gas built up in the shale formation. If you don't believe a poor seal/casing job will let gas flow to the surface on its own, you might want to tell that to the dead rig workers from BP's Deep Horizon. Can we take a chance that even one accident could occur?

As to the question of Fines. Here are a few recent facts about Pennsylvania the most aggressive state about fining violators, They sought penalties for only a little more than a quarter of the violations found in 2010. They levied fines for 4 percent of the violations, with the penalties totaling \$3.7 million. The largest of those was a \$900,000 fine against a drilling company that contaminated the water of 16 homes.

That was less than the profits the company makes in three hours. **THEY MADE MORE THAN \$3.7 MILLION DOLLARS IN 3 HOURS!!!!** So let's remember that if a well becomes contaminated because someone is allowed to drill the town will need enough to clean up any problem to safe living standards not the lowest standards allowed, defend itself against any possible lawsuits brought by residents or even neighboring towns whose water could be affected and I would think the fines being considered should also include the cost for free water and delivery for any and all residents affected until they can use their wells again.

Thanks for listening and for your work.

### **March 1, 2012:**

First off I would like to thank Judi, Tom, Nate, and Sandy for the hard work they put in on Tuesday night. I thought that the meeting went extremely well with everyone having ample time to share their thoughts.

We now face the more difficult tasks of researching/drafting zoning laws... I know this was mentioned at Tues. meeting, but I feel its quite important. (See attached Naples Record)

I truly believe that we should seek the help of a specialist to work in a collaborative effort with respect to zoning laws. PLEASE NOTE: This is in NOT meant to be disrespectful of Mr. Warrens {Kenyon's} capabilities in any way.

**March 7, 2012:**

I just want to ask the town board to include a environmental lawyer, like David Slotjji, to review the newly revised moratorium. We need to feel confident we have no loopholes that would cause legal action against the town. These are the "big guns" we're talking about and having someone so involved and successful with the issue of hydrofracking free of charge is a dream come true. I'm sure our attorney is very good at what he does but the fact is, this hydrofracking is unusual and if we can get a expert's opinion free of charge it makes all sense to do so. We do have to invite him so please be sure to do that..

**March 10, 2012:**

[earthquakes and fracking findings in Ohio released 3-9-12](#)

This link will take you to a very interesting piece on Fracking that aired last night. check it out.

**March 26, 2012:**

Maybe your neighbors will be more skeptical of leasing if they understand that they may not be able to ever get a loan using their property, and they will not be able to sell it, cause buyers can not get a mortgage on leased property

[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/19/us/drilling-property-mortgages-may-get-closer-look-from-agriculture-dept.html?\\_r=3&hp&pagewanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/19/us/drilling-property-mortgages-may-get-closer-look-from-agriculture-dept.html?_r=3&hp&pagewanted=all)

**March 30, 2012:**

great video lots of interesting facts:

<https://www.waterdefense.org/content/natural-gas-exposed-3>

**April 7, 2012:**

A US Geological Survey research team has linked oil and natural gas drilling operations to a series of recent earthquakes from Alabama to the Northern Rockies:

Please take time to read this [article](#) released on April 5th of this year in regards to the new findings between earthquakes and gas drilling. Even though the US Geological Survey (USGS) authors said they do not know why [oil and gas activity might](#) cause an increase in earthquakes the possible explanation is the increase in the number of wells drilled over the past decade and the increase in fluid used in the hydraulic fracturing of each well.

There is no reason to allow a process here in Bristol that will destroy our roads, our water, our wild life and now, with the release of these [new findings](#)

<https://www.commondreams.org/headline/2012/04/05>

[http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/business/technology/2017926528\\_apussciearthquakedrilling.html](http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/business/technology/2017926528_apussciearthquakedrilling.html)

<http://www.statejournal.com/story/17352599/usgs-study-human-activity-certainly-cause-of-increased-seismic-activity>

**May 2, 2012:**

To Whom It May Concern: My husband and I own a farm on ----- Road. It has come to our attention that land has been leased in this area with the intent to of the companies leasing the land to hydrofrack within close proximity to our home and farm. We are extremely concerned about the possibility of hydrofracking in the Bristol, NY area. Hydrofracking uses toxic chemicals that can permanently contaminate ground water which would be detrimental to farms, residences, and all members of the community. We hope the board acts in the best interest of community members and does not allow land to be used by companies who intend to hydrofrack.

**May 22, 2012:**

I would like to invite those who could not make a trip to Pennsylvania, like the Focus Panel & some Town Board Members did, to take a tour of areas fracked in Pennsylvania in these short videos by Scott Cannon, who wanted to ask questions of people living with high volume fracking and took a video camera with him.

It will cost no money in gas or wear and tear on anyone's vehicle. Just some time and an open mind. Check out the bus tour w/concerned open minded county and town officials, a town board meeting, flaring wells, truck traffic & safety, rent hikes, etc. w/folks who live with fracking everyday. Thank you for your time.

[Marcellus Shale Reality Tour Part 1](#)

[Marcellus Shale Reality Tour Part 2 - Dimock Day Trip](#)

[Marcellus Shale Reality Tour Part 3 EPA comes to Dimock](#)

[Marcellus Shale Reality Tour - Part 4 Gas Well Flaring](#)

[Marcellus Shale Reality Tour Part - 5 Erupting Water Well](#)

[Marcellus Shale Reality Tour - Part 6 Eviction Notice](#)

**July 7, 2012:**

National Casualty (Insurance) Company, part of the Nationwide group of insurance companies, has announced that hydraulic fracturing operations are prohibited in relation to properties it insures. The company has determined that the exposures presented by hydraulic fracturing are too great to ignore. Risks involved with hydraulic fracturing are now prohibited for General Liability, Commercial Auto, Motor Truck Cargo, Auto Physical Damage and Public Auto (insurance) coverage. The company said it would not bind risks with this exposure, and any policies currently written with the exposure would be non-renewed (following state requirements).

Among the prohibited risks involved in fracking operations listed by the company are contractors involved in fracking operations, landowners whose land has been leased to lessees with fracking operations, frack sand and frack liquid haulers and site prep (dump trucks, bulldozers) or leasing of tanks.

<http://www.riverreporteronline.com/news/14/2012/07/11/nationwide-insurance-no-fracking-way>

**July 14, 2012:**

10 Questions: to Prepare if Your Community has Fracking Planned - Are You Ready?

by [Nurse Rise ~ Nurses for Safe Water](#) on Monday, June 4, 2012 at 6:52am ·

When we must prepare for the Gas Industry to come to our Community (without our consent) by asking, among other questions, "What is the Emergency Response and Emergency Evacuation plan?", something is very wrong.

If you are finding yourself and your community having to deal with the threat of fracking in your area/your food and water source, here are some questions and points that are very helpful. They were brought to us by Calvin Tillin, the ex-mayor of Dish, Texas. Dish has been the ground zero for compressions stations in Texas.

1. What are the other proposed location
2. Can you see the risk assessment for putting this facility in this location? How bout theother locations?
3. What is the emergency response plan, when, not if, there is a problem?
4. What is the emergency evacuation plan?
5. Why 55 DbA? Too loud, all of the neighbors should go to Radio Shack and buy a sound meter and start taking noise readings several times a day and document them.
6. Will the gas going through the plant be odorized?
7. Ask to see the permit, you may be able to get it on the FERC website. There may be more than just compressor engines involved, they may just hold that surprise for a later date.
8. Do as much air monitoring as you can afford. If it goes in, you will need to start an odor log, and write down each odor event.
9. Every time a compressor starts and stops there will be a blowdown of gas in the line to the atmosphere. They can capture this gas and reintroduce it into the fuel stream, this technology is called compressor blowdown prevention. Ask them if this will be installed. They will say it doesn't need it, but of course they are lying, so ask them how much gas will be released when they have a regular blowdown.
10. Also need to find out if there will be liquids stored on the facility as this could be a source of both water and air contamination.

Hope this helps, do you have an attorney working on it? If you have a good attorney who knows the permitting process, they can usually delay the facility for quite a while.

Thank You to Chefs for Marcellus for the original posting of this information.

**July 16, 2012:**

US insurers won't cover gas drill fracking exposure.

**July 12, 2012**

## RSS Feed Print

By MARY ESCH, Associated Press

ALBANY, N.Y. (AP) — Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co. has become the first major insurance company to say it won't cover damage related to a gas drilling process that blasts chemical-laden water deep into the ground.

The Columbus, Ohio-based company's personal and commercial policies "were not designed to cover" risk from the drilling process, called hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, Nationwide spokeswoman Nancy Smeltzer said Thursday.

The process injects chemically treated water into wells to fracture shale thousands of feet underground and release trapped gas or oil. There are rich shale deposits in parts of Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, West Virginia and elsewhere.

Health and environmental groups claim fracking can contaminate drinking water. The gas industry says it's safe if done properly. Nationwide said risks involved in fracking operations "are too great to ignore" and apply to policies of commercial contractors and landowners who lease property to gas companies.

The Nationwide policy first came to light when an internal memo detailing underwriting guidelines was posted on websites of upstate New York anti-fracking groups and landowner coalitions seeking gas leases. Smeltzer confirmed that the memo was genuine but said it wasn't intended for public dissemination.

The memo reads: "After months of research and discussion, we have determined that the exposures presented by hydraulic fracturing are too great to ignore. Risks involved with hydraulic fracturing are now prohibited for General Liability, Commercial Auto, Motor Truck Cargo, Auto Physical Damage and Public Auto (insurance) coverage."

It said "prohibited risks" apply to landowners who lease land for shale gas drilling and contractors involved in fracking operations, including those who haul water to and from drill sites; pipe and lumber haulers; and operators of bulldozers, dump trucks and other vehicles used in drill site preparation.

A spokesman for a research and outreach program of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, whose members drill most of the nation's oil and gas wells, said nothing in what Nationwide said represented a change in policy for the company. Simon Lomax, the research director for Energy In Depth, said insurers don't sell products specific to individual steps of the oil and gas development process.

"But practical implications aside, the fact that the company would send out a statement this reckless, and this uninformed, should tell us a lot," Lomax said in an emailed statement. "For starters, it tells me that I won't be buying home and car insurance from this company."

Opponents of fracking point to some highly publicized accidents that resulted in contamination.

In late 2010, Houston-based driller Cabot Oil & Gas Corp. settled for \$4.1 million with residents of Dimock, Pa., over gas found in their water. State environmental regulators determined Cabot

contaminated the aquifer underneath homes with explosive levels of methane. A Cabot spokesman said levels of contaminants found didn't pose a threat to human health or the environment.

Jeffrey Hanneman, the Texas-based director of environmental practice at the insurance broker Aon Risk Solutions, said the Nationwide move was "really unique" and he doesn't expect it will be the beginning of a trend.

"To date, all we've seen are some that were hesitant to write environmental coverage," Hanneman said. "But the Nationwide is sort of a broader ban on all the ancillary services related to it (fracking)."

Hanneman noted that there haven't been any substantial claims that targeted companies other than those that own and operate the wells or the contractors who do the drilling. And even those claims have been few and far between.

He said one factor that may be driving Nationwide's decision is that increasing publicity — much of it negative — surrounding fracking makes it possible that any damage claims would go beyond the big oil and gas companies to include the hundreds of supporting businesses such as haulers.

Mike Elmendorf, president of the general contractors' group Associated General Contractors of New York State, said the Nationwide decision was unwelcome news for his members who do work for the gas industry and was not based on facts.

<http://www.usnews.com/news/business/articles/2012/07/12/us-insurer-wont-cover-gas-drill-fracking-exposure>

### **July 17, 2012:**

Hi all, thought this information might be relevant for the focus panel. thanks -----

### INDEX OF THE DIGEST OF INDEPENDENT SCIENCE ON HYDROFRACKING Prepared for Governor Andrew M. Cuomo July, 2012

#### Section 1: HEALTH IMPACTS

1. [Natural Gas Operations from a Public Health Perspective](#) (Colborn, Kwiatkowski, Schultz, Bachran) Human and Ecological Risk Assessment, Sept. 2011
2. [Impacts of Gas Drilling on Human and Animal Health](#) (Bamberger, Oswald) New Solutions, 2012
3. [Local Experiences Related to the Marcellus Shale Industry](#) (Covey) Troy Community Hospital, Bradford, PA - Power Point document
4. [Battlement Mesa Draft HIA](#) (Colorado School of Public Health) February 2011
5. [Fatalities Among Oil and Gas Extraction Workers -- United States 2003-2006](#) (Node, Conway) CDC MMR Weekly April 2008
6. [Chemical and Biological Risk Assessment for Natural Gas Extraction in New York](#) (Bishop) March 2011

#### Section 2: WATER CONTAMINATION

7. [Potential Contaminant Pathways from Hydraulically Fractured Shale of Aquifers](#) (Myers) National Ground Water Association. Ground Water, April 2012
8. [Methane Contamination of Drinking Water Accompanying Gas-Well Drilling and Hydraulic Fracturing](#) (Osborn, Vengosh, Warner, Jackson) PNAS 2011

9. Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing on Water Resources (Swackhamer, University of Minnesota) - Power Point document
10. Investigation of Ground Water Contamination near Pavillion, Wyoming (draft) - (Summary only) (DiGiulio, Wilkin, Miller, Oberly) Environmental Protection Agency, 2011
11. Geochemical Evidence For Possible Natural Migration of Marcellus Formation Brine to Shallow Aquifers in Pennsylvania (Warner, Jackson, Darrah, Osborn, Down, Zhao, White, Vengosh) Proceedings of the National Academies of Science of the United States 2012

Section 3: AIR POLLUTION

12. Human Health Risk Assessment of Air Emissions from Development of Unconventional Natural Gas Resources (McKenzie, Witter, Newman, Adgate) Colorado School of Public Health, 2012
13. Air Pollutant Emissions from Shale Gas Development and Production (Robinson, Carnegie Mellon) - Power Point document

Section 4: CLIMATE IMPACTS

14. Methane and the Greenhouse Gas Footprint of Natural Gas from Shale Formations (Howarth, Santoro, Ingraffea) Climate Change, 2011
15. Venting and Leaking of Methane from Shale Gas Development: Response to Cathles et al (Howarth, Santoro, Ingraffea) Climate Change, 2012
16. Coal To Gas: The Influence of Methane Leakage (Wigley) Climate Change, August 2011

Section 5: WELLS / RADIATION RISKS

17. History of Oil and Gas Well Abandonment in New York (Link not available) (Bishop) SUNY College at Oneonta, 2012
18. Radium Content of Oil- and Gas-Field Produced Waters in the Northern Appalachian Basin (Rowan, Engle, Kirby, Kraemer) USGS 2011

The documents contained in this digest are the property of the copyright owners and are reprinted for educational purposes only. Compilation prepared by Grassroots Environmental Education.

<http://www.grassrootsinfo.org/frackingdigest.html>

**August 9, 2012:**

Please include us among those residents of the town of Bristol who are firmly opposed to allowing hydrofracking in the Town of Bristol. -----  
----- State Rt. 64, Canandaigua.

**August 9, 2012:** I have minor concerns about the process. I think it has been around long enough to have addressed the safety concerns most of us have. My biggest concern is the effect it will have on our way of life. I don't want to see our town over run with large truck traffic. I can envision work sites that are unsightly, very dusty, loud and never any darkness because of all night operations. I don't think this is what we want to see in our town. Honeoye storage is a very god neighbor. If the sites could be like them and have the gas piped out then it would not be a problem, but that's not going to happen because the infrastructure is not there. I love the town of Bristol for what it is, a beautiful, peaceful place to live and raise a family. Please take this into consideration when making any decisions.

**August 12, 2012:**

To the Town of Bristol Focus Panel In Regards to Hydrofracking in Bristol

We could have lived anywhere. We chose Bristol.

Attracted by the incredible natural beauty and wildlife, the fresh clean air, emphasis on ruralness as opposed to industry, we knew this was where we wanted to make our home and raise our child. The years have passed and our discussions have turned from school districts and libraries to retirement and taxes. Yet, we decided that this was where we want to live out our remaining years.

A few years ago you sent a survey out to your residents soliciting input on how we would like to see our town in the future. My guess is that none of those responses included our beautiful hillsides stripped bare from hydrofracking, our wells polluted or dry, heavy trucks echoing off the hillsides as they haul off the most beautiful place in Ontario County. No one as of yet knows the long term effect of hydrofracking. It is a gamble that no one, especially Bristol should consider. Is the money worth throwing away everything that makes Bristol the gem of the Finger Lakes? As a world citizen we cannot condone the practice of hydrofracking here or anywhere else. We implore you to vote no.

**August 13, 2012:**

I have read Tom Wilber's book "Under the Surface" and attended a talk given by him in Geneva as well as researched this topic on-line and discussed it with friends and neighbors. My opinion is that it is not worth the risks involved and I do not trust the gas companies nor the government to do the right thing. I would rather see us invest in renewable resources rather than something we are not sure we can do safely or can even agree on how much gas there is under ground. The amount of water that has to be trucked in and out and disposed of (safely?) will require many roads and lots of large trucks to say nothing of the chemicals to be used which we are not told of because the gas companies say they are proprietary. Bottom line is I would not like fracking in Bristol Town, Ontario County, New York State, The United States or the World.

**August 27, 2012:**

Bristol Town Board,

In regards to the issue on Hydrofracking in our area. My husband and I both feel that this is not an option for our area. The water supply in the Bristol area we feel is not of high quality or quantity. We feel doing this procedure would compromise our water supply.

**September 11, 2012:**

Fracking – who benefits? The gas companies, some land owners who'll be able to move away with their profits when our way of life is destroyed, a few businesses catering to visitors and some people needing short-term employment. For everyone else, constant traffic, noise night and day, the stink of diesel fumes and the very real threat of spills, water pollution and loss of their wells. For the county and the towns, road destruction and increased use of services, leading to tax increases. For the U.S.of A., we ship our gas to other countries- gas we will need in the future.

Long term, poisons put in the ground will persist there forever. Over tens, hundreds and thousands of years, these poisons will move through aquifers. We will permanently affect our water supply.

Humans existed for a very long time without a high technology system. But we could not exist without water.

We ask that our town of Bristol ban Fracking.

**September 16, 2012:**

To Whom it May Concern:

From what we have read and heard about hydrofracking, we believe it is an unproven concept with far more risk of harming our environment than any perceived benefits of increasing natural gas supply or jobs.

We use a well for our water and do not want any harm done to our precious water supply. In fact, our worldwide water supply is at risk from many things already and hydrofracking only seems to increase the risk of harming the supply.

We are strongly against hydrofracking in the Town of Bristol and everywhere.

**September 18, 2012:**

Bristol Focus Panel and Town Board,

I have chosen an anti-fracking position for now. I believe the industry is not only ruining our drinking water, but may also be building up a reserve of waste larger (and perhaps more toxic) than local landfills which I have watched become mountains, just within the last two decades. Perhaps in the future better methods and better failsafes will be developed to access these pockets - as we allow them to remain "reserves". I am strongly in favor of renewable energy sources such as photo-voltaic and wind energy. I plan to attend the Focus Panel program on the 26th. Thanks for the mailing and notification.

**September 22, 2012:**

Dear Focus Panel Members,

Attached are several documents you may find helpful in your endeavor to present a clear, factual and unbiased picture of what high volume horizontal hydro-fracking would mean to the Town of Bristol and its citizens.

All of the information contained within the documents echoes my concerns regarding allowing the practice into the town at this time. Until there are some finalized reports on the impacts of drilling (like the one mentioned below\*), solid processes and procedures in place to protect the environment, our fresh water resources and town inhabitants alike, this practice should not be allowed into Bristol or anywhere in New York State.

There is no shortage of natural gas in this country and no significant increase in demand to warrant the enormous effort to extract shale gas all over the US. Most of the gas is shipped overseas to industrialized countries who are willing to pay a higher price for our gas. When demand here rises and our resources are depleted we will be the ones paying the higher price. This is a win-win for the utility companies and a lose-lose for our community. We risk our health, safe drinking water, natural vistas, local economy and peaceful way of life. What we stand to lose is far greater than the short term gains offered by the gas industry. Once the gas boom goes bust (and it will) we will be out on a limb trying to put back together a community where it is desirable to live.

Anybody can look up the economics of what has been happening in other states where fracking occurs. It paints a bleak picture overall.

\*A first progress report is planned for late 2012 on the 'EPA's Study of Hydraulic Fracturing and Its Potential Impact on Drinking Water Resources'. A final draft report is expected to be released for public comment and peer review in 2014.

Below are additional links for your information.

<http://www.citizenscampaign.org/campaigns/hydro-fracking.asp>

[http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/us/DRILLING\\_DOWN\\_SERIES.html](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/us/DRILLING_DOWN_SERIES.html)

<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/natural-gas/index.html>

<http://nyrad.org/index.html>

**September 23, 2012:**

To:Town of Bristol Focus Panel

Fellow Citizens of Bristol,

Thank you to the members of the Focus Panel for your hard work to gather all the information you have gathered, on the issue of High-Volume Horizontal Hydrofracturing (HVHH), and on the views of the townspeople. This is an extremely important decision that will have impacts that will be both widely felt and long lasting. Thank you also, to the Town Board for their care in making these decisions.

I made a brief statement at a Town Board meeting several months ago, expressing my opposition to allowing this practice in Bristol. I'm writing here to have the concerns and views of my wife and I included in the work of the focus panel.

My name is -----, and my wife is ----- . We have lived at ----- Baptist Hill Road and have paid taxes here for nearly 28 years. (Phone # 585-----) We love where we live and our connection to this land. We are concerned that the pursuit of HVHH around us would be harmful to the water, the air, the quiet, and the beauty that we enjoy now. We have no intention of leasing our land for drilling, and feel our rights to our privacy and the use of our land would be violated if this practice were to be allowed in Bristol. We are concerned that the value of our property would be compromised and that protection from our insurance company would be withdrawn. We ask that our representatives labor to protect us and all of our fellow residents by banning HVHH.

Some specific concerns –

It seems likely that the things we are concerned about have been raised by one or more people already, but let us mention those of greatest concern to us.

Contamination of our well with methane, fracking fluids, or other unknown migration of by-products from the process. This process of fracturing wells is NOT the same as the procedures and processes that the industry says have been used for 50 years. The extent, the chemicals, the pressures and the surrounding areas that are affected are all more extreme than what was used to drill the current wells in Bristol.

Water Use Given the HUGE quantities of water used to frack each well (of many on each platform), we wonder “Where will this water come from?” As large as the Finger Lakes seem, extraction of MILLIONS of gallons of water from any one lake would certainly change lake levels. Are our neighbors along the lake shores prepared to extend their docks to meet the new shorelines? Any extraction of water from underground sources would almost certainly have an effect on the water table. This in a town where many folks are forced to transport water to their wells even in normal conditions. As this year has brought drought to many areas, we can't be sure that water will even be available at current use levels, much less with the enormous extra demand of HVHH.

Pollution (Air, Water, Noise) Unimaginable numbers of large trucks, with their exhaust and noise (add on the effects of their weight on the local roads over the many trips required). Huge compressors running day and night, also with exhaust and noise pollution (can many of us even imagine how big and noisy those machines are?). Danger to surface water and water table from retention ponds of frack blow-back, and the potential for spills and unintended leaks from trucks, ponds, wells.

We are also concerned that we would be forced to participate in these problems without any say or opt-out if any of our neighbors within several miles chooses to allow drilling on their lands. The way the state laws are structured, the few would be allowed to impose drastic hardships on the many, whether they themselves live in the area (or move away with their new-found riches). This is fundamentally unfair and un-American.

Tourism has always been an important part of the Finger Lakes and Bristol Hills economies, even more so as the wine trails and other artisan food endeavors have grown and worked hard to market themselves. We can see from photographs of other states the destructive effect that placing

large industrial drilling sites in the middle of our natural surroundings would have on tourism. Not just the visual effects, but the noise and air pollution and the large volumes of truck traffic would make this area less desirable to visit, much less to live in.

I am the seventh generation of my family that came to Bristol in the late 1700s. The choices and decisions of townfolk and their representatives throughout these centuries has made Bristol the place we all care for and want to live in. Are we making decisions that will make the lives of the seventh generation from now better, or will we change Bristol forever for them?

**September 25, 2012:**

To the Focus Panel and the Bristol Town Board:

After Dr. Ingraffea's presentation in Honeoye it is clear that hydrofracking should not be allowed anywhere unless or until safer technology is developed. Dr. Ingraffea has impeccable qualifications plus he is not in a position to profit whichever position he were to take. Dr. Ingraffea stated that there are too many unknown impacts to health and quality of life to proceed with fracking. He emphasized that the technology is not advanced enough at this time to frack safely. In addition, he pointed out that the failure rate for new wells is 6%. If that 6% failure occurs in an aquifer, how can we say the process is safe? Also one has to consider the safety of older wells. Dr. Ingraffea cited a Schlumberger study which found that 50% of wells fail at 20-25 years of age. At that point, the wells are the state's responsibility, meaning the taxpayers'.

Fortunately, NY can look to PA to see the impacts of fracking. Dr. Ingraffea noted that 5,000 wells have been drilled there and hundreds of families' drinking water has been impacted. Why would we expect it would be any different here?

My husband and I attended a presentation on fracking at York Central School this summer. We were very impressed by a woman executive from Once Again Nutbutters in Nunda, NY. She summed up the case against fracking as being a moral issue. There are many greedy people who want to obscure the dangers of hydrofracking so that they can profit. It apparently does not bother them that their actions can pollute drinking water and destroy property values.

Something that has occurred to me after attending several board meetings is that concerned Bristol residents have been painted by the board as being too emotional on the issue of fracking. One is supposed to extrapolate that these residents are therefore not accurate in their criticisms of hydrofracking. This is a deception. If these residents were not upset that their drinking water and property values could be ruined, all in the pursuit of wealth, their reaction would be abnormal. Also it has been stressed at meetings that we need to look at what science says, as if science has never been perverted in the quest for a goal. It is time to use common sense. When one injects such huge quantities of water and chemicals underground, some of which are admittedly toxic, how can one say that it can be controlled and is safe? And why would we look to the gas companies, who only stand to profit, for honest information? We should be seeking out independent, informed people like Dr. Ingraffea to educate us.

**September 26, 2012:**

Town of Bristol:

My name is -----. My husband and I own a cabin ----- Road. In response to your request, I would like to give my opinion on the process of hydro-fracturing for natural gas. I know the importance of being able to rely on our resources for energy, however I believe that extracting those resources should be done in a way that is not harmful to the environment. There are too many unanswered questions for this process. Hydrofracking uses immense quantities of water- where will that come from? I am concerned about damage done to aquifers. Large amounts of

chemicals are added to the water, put into the ground, then pumped out. Where will all that contaminated water go to be treated, how will it get there and how will it be treated? What about increased truck travel on rural roads-will the gas companies help to maintain the roads? Those are my main concerns. The gas companies say it's more important to provide jobs to extract the gas, but I believe that should not be done at the expense of our water supplies and the land.

**September 28, 2012:**

Dear members of the Focus Group,

I want to express my appreciation for all the hard work you have done to gather and present information on such a complex and important issue as High Volume Hydrofracking, and to reveal possible outcomes for Bristol if fracking were to be approved and initiated. I think you did an amazing job, and that all of you in the Focus Group and our Town Council should be commended for taking this proactive initiative.

In view of the complexity of this issue, and the newness of the technology involved, it is understandable that you could not always be precise or comprehensive in your presentation (as some of you mentioned). My husband and I had undertaken some research ourselves, but based on the information you provided, we apparently hadn't even begun to scratch the surface. I thought it might be useful if I shared some important things we learned.

1) We had not been aware of the implications of the Gas Mining Statute in New York State, which takes away local control over just about anything related to fracking with the exception of "local roads" and "real property tax law". Important factors such as intensity of drilling and locations of the wells would be entirely out of the town's control, and it would be an "all-or-nothing" situation. So, if the State's moratorium is lifted, and if the Town Council were to decide to allow fracking in Bristol, the whole process would basically be out of our hands. I think that is extremely important for all residents to know about.

2) Another important piece of information concerns "Compulsory Integration." I understand that if 60% of the land surrounding my property is leased for fracking, we and other surrounding non-leasing property owners will be forced to "integrate our interests with those of the unit operator" in order to "complete a 640 acre site". Basically that means that, although I would not have to give access to my property above-ground, one or more wells could be dug right near my property, and connecting pipes could be installed underneath my land, my home, and my private well—without my consent. All I could do would be to choose one of three options (becoming a royalty owner, a participating owner, or a non-participating owner). I even would be forced to travel to Albany to attend a "Compulsory Integration Hearing". Frankly, this kind of policy is hard to imagine here in the U.S. (The former Soviet Union comes to mind more readily.)

3) Apparently millions of gallons of water per well are needed to extract the gas from the shale. This may very well strain our own or neighboring water resources, especially considering the fact that we've just experienced a hot, dry summer, affecting our water supply (as mentioned during the presentation). I would add that past drought conditions may not have been a fluke. If this is, indeed, a trend, as the vast majority of scientists predict, water conservation is and will become increasingly important. So we should not waste this resource on anything less than crucial to our welfare, and we should do our utmost to protect its safety. We learned that toxic chemicals are added to the water during the fracking process, and methane may be transferred from the shale. Varying concentrations of chemicals and higher levels of methane may end up in our wells, as has happened in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. In

view of this, and in view of major calamities that have occurred even with conventional mining operations, it is clear that our water safety cannot be vouchsafed in the fracking process, either by the DEC or the gas companies themselves. To me that would be unconscionable, for ourselves and for future generations—despite the temporary economic benefits fracking may bring to the town.

4) You presented a host of other issues, including traffic concerns and noise and light pollution, but I don't believe you brought up the likelihood of an increase in the number and severity of earthquakes as a result of the fracking process. This has been mentioned in the scientific literature, and it is another important factor to take into account when deciding on this issue.

5) Finally, I have a question about the last question on the survey: You asked if "I would like all Ontario County Towns to adopt a uniform plan". I did not know how to answer this, because this issue had not been addressed by the panel. Has there been an outreach to other communities to band together on this issue? Would a uniform County plan have more weight than individual Town plans when it comes to whether or not fracking will be allowed, or, if it is allowed, how much local control will be possible? I would appreciate if you could let me know.

I fervently hope that you will continue to make your findings public so that residents will be fully informed and make their voices heard based on facts and not assumptions. I will urge my fellow residents to become knowledgeable on this issue and to let you and the Town Council know where they stand by filling out and returning the survey provided.

Thank you for considering these comments.

**October 1, 2012:**

I have been very wary of allowing hydrofracking. From what I have read, it is dangerous. Water is a natural resource which already is becoming scarce. Being a religious person, I am also mindful of the Bible's prediction of the extinction of water. At the last election, I read up on all the candidates and voted for only those who were opposed to hydrofracking. Of course, they were the underdogs, so my vote made no difference. I get so fed up with those who have the "deep pockets" get their way, and that their only concern is money.

**October 2, 2012:**

We want to ban hydraulic fracturing in Bristol.

**October 15, 2012:**

To our Town Board & Focus Panel,

Having attended the town forum on Sept. 26 concerning High-Volume Hydrofracking, I am extremely disappointed that this idea is even being considered.

We moved to this beautiful area twenty years ago and cannot imagine what destruction would lie ahead if this plan moved forward.

No monetary sum or promise of jobs gained from raping and pillaging our land can equal the value of our clean water, clean air and clean soil. Contamination

could destroy aquatic habitats, plantlife, wildlife habitats and our own human habitats. We must be pragmatic in our approach and realize that what affects

one, affects another and another and can have broad repercussions.

I have respect for our land and a responsibility to preserve it, protect it and wish to leave it better than I found it, thus contributing in a positive way to my community and the footprint I leave on this earth. Hopefully we can preserve this splendid area for many generations to come.

Therefore, I vote NO, not ever, not in Bristol, not in Ontario County and hopefully not in New York State.

**October 20, 2012:**

Hi all,

I came across this article today about the need for an independent and thorough health risk assessment of fracking in NYS and thought that it was important to share it with you all

<http://www.alternet.org/fracking/will-fracking-sicken-and-kill-more-new-yorkers-it-employs?akid=9563.115644.vblxR8&rd=1&src=newsletter730187&t=18&paging=off>

**November 3, 2012**

I am deeply dismayed over our local “debate” over HVHF and the prospects for this dangerous and ill-considered policy taking hold in our pristine community.

Serious discussion at the national level regarding the degradation of the earth’s environment has been nearly unmentionable in the current season because at least one side of the conversation---yes, that would be the Republicans---is in refusal of the facts and will manipulate the issue to place any advocate of environmental regulation or scientific study in political peril. Pragmatism in this situation fails to address reality and everyone’s future is compromised. But there is no moral equation between those who understand the perils of HVHF and those invested in its financial remuneration. Yes, I am claiming that support of this policy is not only a bad policy, it is unethical, *as the article below clearly demonstrates.*

By choosing instead false postures meant to juxtapose competing interests (jobs and economy versus a healing earth), and as we see below, working the legal seams and using suspect ethics to advance their financial interests over the prospects of a healthy future, we will face stark realities. This article below provide palpable evidence of the political and legal tactics of those whose economic interests mean to superintend over our future of clean water. Of course, low information and too much Fox news may once again trump the prospects of a more honest discussion.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/03/us/Pennsylvania-omitted-poison-data-in-water-report.html?hp>

And yes, I do write like this, this is no robo-letter composed by someone else. This is your neighbor.

**Public Input *In Favor* of High-Volume Hydrofracking  
Written Comments from the Surveys**

1. There hasn’t been any mass exodus from PA. they are living with it and liking it. The huge majority of PA residents delighted with the industry, jobs, and revenue. Other states have taken all the

risk while New Yorkers sit and watch. Now we're in a position to benefit from their hard work and risk. The only people in NY against it are the selfish ones. You know the ones that don't want any inconvenience in their lives, like noise, dirt, and traffic delays. They feel that others can put up with it but not them. Certainly not reflective of the people who founded this country. More reflective of people who don't care if this country goes down the tubes!

2. The anti fracking are a bunch of antihuman, psudo science environmental wackos, communistic morons who actually, I believe are actually tied into the population control movement. If you remember the holocast, these people have the same ideology as the Nazies.

3. Our great nation relies on energy independence. Natural gas needs to play a vital role in this nation's energy equation.

### **Public Input *In Favor* of High-Volume Hydrofracking Written Comments from gmail and Letters**

On this g-mail account and a letter, three people have contributed their views expressing their support of high-volume, hydraulic fracturing. These comments are copied in whole, with edits only to keep the person's personal information confidential:

For the sake of brevity I have provided four bullets: (this letter to the Focus Panel had no date)

- The Town has correctly adopted a moratorium. They recognize that State law will prevail. If DEC approves of hydro-fracturing the Town should develop environmental and land use legislation.
- The "not in my backyard" mentality had been used when wind farms and cell towers were introduced to Bristol. Certainly sight and environmental pollution became the issue. Now it's the preservation of our natural resources. The Town has, in the past, successfully met zoning challenges and is capable of doing it again.
- We must recognize that hydro-fracturing has been successful in the Bristol area. Success without danger to our natural resources, "the proof is in the pudding."
- It is imperative that the Town and County act proactively in establishing regulations.

#### **March 24, 2012:**

I and a group of investors are involved in acquiring mineral right leases as well as right-of ways for pipelines in the southern tier involved in the Marcellus Shale deposits. We have done extensive research and attended several seminars where discussions of Hydrofracking were the topic. Hydrofracking has been in use here in the U.S. for nearly 30 yrs. and at present there has been no solid scientific data to indicate it is a serious problem. The "Tree-Huggers" are the main resistance to Hydrofracking as they are to many other issues. If you did some research you will find a new Hydrofracking solution has been developed which is pure enough one could drink the solution.

Our country needs fossil fuel energy and with the amount of Oil/gas inside our borders we could easily become nearly totally non dependant on foreign sources for our energy needs. Those who believe solar & wind power will supply our needs are dreamers as that technology is 30 years away before it becomes cost effective. Besides wind & solar power depend upon rare earth elements and that s apply source currently comes from China which supplies 97% of the world's needs and they

have cut back on exports of those materials. The only U.S. company which currently supplies is MolyCorp, a California company whose hands are tied by government regulations due to the process used to refine rare earth elements.

So, I guess my point is, forget the regulations and open up your minds to scientific facts and allow drilling for oil and natural gas and oil. Currently I am not aware of any deposits in our area large enough to get the attention of any large scale drilling companies.

Good luck with your research and be wary of the screams of the "Tree-Huggers"!

**August 24, 2012:**

Town of Bristol Focus Panel:

My name is -----, I am a current resident of the Town of Bristol residing at ----- since September 1997. I would like to thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion(s) regarding the controversial process known as High Volume Hydro-Fracturing for Natural Gas. I strongly urge the Town of Bristol to allow this method of energy production to commence. I am very well 'in the know' on the pros and cons of this emotionally charged argument. My job affords me the ability to talk to people from every state and county/Parrish nationwide. In those areas that have the abundance of this natural resource, I will often ask for their 'local knowledge' both the good and bad experiences. I am somewhat surprised to say that there is a very high acceptance. Sure, there are those who are cautious, as we should all be, but once the initial 'drilling' has been completed, the impact is negligible to the surrounding communities. Case in point, we have 'well heads' scattered very close to my residence.

Looking at this from the town's perspective, I would hope that if you decide to go forward, you put in place an adequate means of compensation for our community. Be it taxes, or 'rights' permits or whatever else you might call it. I can envision putting these extra \$\$ to good use (infrastructure improvements), and to keep our taxes down. I would also expect that the landowners would be able to profit from any productive wells on their property. I appreciate what the Town of Bristol has done in my 15 years here regarding the zoning decisions that have been implemented. I would not like to see the surrounding municipalities cashing in, and this community not! I have family in Pennsylvania, and in the areas of high fracking activity, there has been a renaissance. Old homes and businesses are being restored. Property values are climbing, and most of all folks are working. In Williamsport, a resourceful businessman has created an industry to recycle the water used in the fracking process. He has created hundreds of jobs in doing so.

I understand the 'alarmists' claims. But, they tend to sensationalize their views. They embellish on what 'they have either heard or read' and prey on other's emotions. The facts are available on the internet as you have stated in your letter. All one has to do is read about the Spotted Owl farce in Oregon, or the Delta Smelt controversy in the most fertile and productive valley in California to see what negative opinions can do. The Spotted Owl was not threatened by the logging industry that was completely destroyed by the fear mongers, it was caused by a non-indigenous predator that somehow arrived on our shores. And regarding the Delta Smelt, almost 50,000 people have been essentially put out of work. All for what? So that we can all go back to reading by candlelight? The charge that the 'chemicals' used for Hydro-Fracturing are a big mystery is flatly a lie! (see attached)

I have one request in particular. I strongly feel that you must publicize the 'members' names and occupations of all those on the Town of Bristol Focus Panel, to ensure that we have fair representation of both sides of the argument. Most typically, it's the alarmists who make the most 'noise'!

**October 3, 2012:**

I have 6.5 acres on Rt 64 across from ----- . I would like to allow high volume hydraulic fracturing in Bristol. My mailing address is ----- Rochester NY 14626. I would still like to learn more and learn about how to get a permit ?

In your letter to the Bristol residents, you asked how will the community be affected by Hydro-fracturing. First, natural gas prices are the lowest they have been in ten years. As many people in the town use natural gas, this has to be very beneficial. Then consider how the price of gasoline and oil have increased. If you contact any geologist, you will learn that the Marcellus Shale in our area does not harbor any marketable amount of natural gas. Therefore, there will be no drilling in that formation in our area. The drilling in the Southern Tier and Pa. where large amounts of natural gas have been found has been in the Marcellus Shale.

I am sure you have read the state regulations on how wells have to be cased and cemented to protect from ground water. All ground water comes from rain and snow that has soaked into the ground. Contamination comes from spills on the surface of the ground. This is the area that needs to be strictly regulated! Stop and think about all the waste water in our town that is discharged into the ground and has the possibility of contaminating our water wells. I am sure you have all looked at the fracking process on the internet, which explains it much better than I can. I worked for Honeoye Storage Corp., which is a natural gas storage field in the town. Nearly all their wells were fracked, some dating back to the 1960's. All the information found on the internet seems to be positive about this process. No where have I seen any positive proof of Hydro-fracturing causing damage. There may have been instances when spillage and improper handling of the wasted water has occurred. As I stated before this is the area that has to be strictly regulated. I have included two newspaper articles with this letter. The EPA rules water wells are not contaminated by fracking. Fracking foes often used flawed science to sway opinions. (I understand that some drilling companies are now drilling water wells before they drill in order to establish water quality before and after the drilling process.) I believe that the most important thing people need to realize is how dependent this country is on gasoline, heating oil, natural gas and electricity. Think of how our lives would be affected if one or more of these energy sources were unavailable, or so high priced they were unaffordable to the average household. We do not, as of now, have the capability of supplying all our nation's needs. From working in the natural gas business the many comments I have heard is, "I don't care where they drill, but not in my back yard." Well, it has to be in someone's back yard and if we want a product we have to make some sacrifices. We have to be willing to make these sacrifices and be less dependent on foreign energy resources. My hope is that residents of Bristol will listen to the positive sides of Hydro-Fracturing.

## **Public Input *Not Clear* in Terms of Pro or Con**

*[Clarification: the resident did not answer question #3 on whether or not to allow HVHF in Bristol, but rather, put a question mark next to the Yes/No section, however, he/she did not want to ban HVHF in Bristol.]*

***[On the front side of this survey, the resident stated, “see other side;” where he/she created a list of 5 main points. Point #1 is missing due to the survey tops being cut off.]***

**1. Missing . . . .**

2. I believe an all out ban would be unfair and hard to enforce depending on what the state does.
3. I have seen some of the sites in PA. They were restored and cleaned up as to their original condition. Area east of Mansfield PA. is a good mix of wind turbines and drill sites.
4. I would like to see more info. on long term environmental damage in PA.
5. Compromise may be needed by all sides of issue to make workable regulation at any government level.

In the Focus Panel's original charge from the Town Board, it stated: "The town of Bristol aims to protect the community, cultural, historical, recreational and environmental resources within the town." The Focus Panel's "mission will be to objectively study available materials as it relates to zoning structures and regulation based on current ECL laws . . . [and to assess] . . . the potential positive and negative impacts on the community. . . It is incumbent upon the Focus Panel to ensure that recommendations are uniform, fair, objective and consistent. The end result will be to make recommendations to the Town Board and Planning Boards for future zoning regulations as it relates to the current industry." (See Appendix B)

Based on this charge, the Bristol Focus Panel has extensively studied materials, attended presentations, read from various sources, and dialogued with industry representatives and knowledgeable experts. It is this Panel's belief that the following recommendations are:

- fair to residents and significant businesses (such as Honeoye Storage)
- uniform in the protection of property rights and community welfare
- representative of objective study, discernment, and review of public comments
- an accurate record of all written input from Bristol citizens on Bristol's current Comprehensive Plan as well as viewpoints on hydrofracking

Since Honeoye Storage Corporation is a well-established local company, has a proven record as a good neighbor, and has significant support from the community, the Bristol Focus Panel in no way intends to interfere with the company's long-established, traditional, low-volume hydrofracking and storage processes. The following recommendations apply *only* to unconventional, high-volume hydrofracking and must not in any way interfere with the usual business of Honeoye Storage Corporation.

A group of volunteers already familiar with the topic is willing to implement these recommendations. Scott Battle, Jude Ellis, Sandy Riker, Judi Salsburg Taylor, and Tom Stevens volunteered to continue serving the Town

**Given the overwhelming majority, strong public record and the research completed and then presented to the community, the Bristol Focus Panel makes the following recommendations to the Bristol Town Board and Bristol Planning Board:**

- 1. Extend current moratorium, Local Law #3, for additional eighteen months**
- 2. Research the negative and positive impacts of a ban on high volume hydrofracking, and determine if a ban on HVHF poses too great a risk to Bristol and its residents. The following should be considered in this research process:**
  - **The Dryden / Middlefield decision in NYS Court of Appeals**
  - **The final draft of the SGEIS**
  - **Cuomo's decision on HVHF**
  - **Health Impact Study**
- 3. Review and analyze local infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, water drainage, etc., to create a baseline inventory.**
- 4. Assess the current local zoning laws regarding land use, road use, traffic restrictions, and all other activities related to heavy industry and high-impact uses.**

**5. Strengthen, and if necessary create, local zoning laws in order to keep the Bristol community safe from all aspects of heavy industry and its resultant operations. These revised or new laws should:**

- **Ensure consistency with current Bristol Comprehensive Plan**
- **Ensure consistency with the Town of Bristol’s mission statement which states: “Preserve and encourage a clean, naturally beautiful, rural environment with carefully planned commercial development, aesthetically pleasing, controlled residential growth, and increased recreational opportunities, while encouraging the preservation of agricultural lands”**
- **Strengthen and/or create local zoning laws related to noise, light, air, and water pollution in order to ensure consistency with the current Bristol Comprehensive Plan, Mission Statement and to protect the general community’s health, safety and welfare. (e.g. waste disposal, underground injections, transportation of hazardous materials, etc.)**
- **Strengthen local zoning laws related to traffic congestion in order to ensure consistency with the current Bristol Comprehensive Plan and Mission Statement.**
- **Strengthen local zoning laws related to heavy and light truck traffic in order to ensure consistency with current Bristol Comprehensive Plan, Mission Statement and to protect the health, safety, welfare and the quality of life for the community at large.**

A group of volunteers already familiar with the topic is willing to contribute with the process of these recommendations; Scott Battle, Jude Ellis, Sandy Riker, Judi Salsburg Taylor, and Tom Stevens volunteer to continue serving the Town in this way.

## **Appendix A**

### **New York State Environmental Conservation Law**

§ 23-0303. Administration of article.

1. **Except to the extent that the administration of this article is specifically entrusted to other agencies or officers of the state by its provisions, such administration shall be by the department.** Geological services for the department in connection with the administration of this article shall be provided by or in cooperation with the state geologist. Within appropriations therefore the department is authorized to employ such personnel as may be necessary for the administration of this article and may also employ or secure the services of such engineering, technical and other consultants as it may require from time to

time.

2. **The provisions of this article shall supersede all local laws or ordinances relating to the regulation of the oil, gas and solution mining industries; but shall not supersede local government jurisdiction over local roads or the rights of local governments under the real property tax law.**
3. a. The commissioner shall accept from municipalities requests for funds from the oil and gas fund to reimburse the municipality for costs incurred in repairing damages to municipal land or property. Such requests shall include such explanatory material and documentation as the commissioner may require.  
  
b. The commissioner and director of the budget, may recommend payment to the municipality to satisfy the request for reimbursement upon finding that:
  - (1) The municipality has made a bona fide effort to seek relief and recover its costs from those deemed to be responsible and any other appropriate avenues, but has been unsuccessful;
  - (2) The damage was a direct result of activities regulated under this article and that the amount of funds requested is reasonable in view of such damages; and
  - (3) The costs were incurred after the effective date of this subdivision.

## **Appendix B**

### **Charge given to Bristol Focus Panel in January of 2012**

#### **Focus Group- Town of Bristol**

The Town of Bristol has legitimate goals and aims to protect the community, cultural, historical, recreational and environmental resources within the town. The Town board believes that studying this issue is necessary so that high volume hydrofracking operations are regulated to protect the town's predominant residential and agricultural land uses and to protect the environment from potential negative impacts. Potential negative impacts to local water wells, roads, and agricultural lands need to have careful, objective study of an industry that has existed since the 1820's in New York State.

In order to give the subject of high volume hydrofracking a basis for community involvement, it is recommended that a focus group of no more than five members, be formed to allow for investigation and study of guidelines. It is further recommended that members include a representative from the town board, 2 from the town planning board, a citizen with a background of natural gas and a local citizen of concerned interest form the focus group.

Their mission will be to objectively study available materials as it relates to zoning structures and regulation based on current ECL laws (Environmental Conservation Law), potential positive and negative impacts on the community. It is recommended that the focus group consider legislation and information from other communities that have or will be impacted by this technology (HVHF).

It is incumbent upon the focus group to ensure that recommendation are uniform, fair, objective and consistent.

The end result will be to make recommendations to the Town Board and Planning Boards for future zoning regulation as it relates to the current industry.

RAG 09JAN2012

[Robert A. Green January 9th, 2012]

## **Appendix C**

### **Letter Sent to Bristol Residents**

To: All residents in the Town of Bristol  
From: Town of Bristol Focus Panel  
Topic: Resident Input on High Volume Hydro-Fracturing for Natural Gas

High-Volume Horizontal Hydrofracking is one of the most important topics this community has ever faced; it is crucial that each and every resident and landowner in the town understand the facts as to how this industry will affect your home, your family, and our community.

As you may already know, New York State's temporary ban on High-Volume Horizontal Hydro-Fracturing for extracting natural gas may be lifted as early as this summer when the Department of Environmental Conservation releases its final Environmental Impact Statement. At that point, the DEC can begin issuing permits to the oil and gas companies to allow this new method of drilling in New York State.

The Town of Bristol joined numerous towns in the Finger Lakes Region and across the state when we recently passed a moratorium on this practice. The moratorium has a two-fold purpose. First, it gives our town a limited time period to collect information and data on this new high volume methodology so as to make an informed decision as to whether or not our town will allow High Volume Horizontal Drilling. Second, during the moratorium, the town will need to revise our zoning laws so as to adequately reflect our community's views. The revised zoning laws must be in place before the moratorium expires.

A Focus Panel was appointed to research the many facts and perspectives surrounding this complex issue in order to make informed recommendations to our Town Board. It is essential that the Focus Panel consider the concerns of *all* residents. Therefore, we strongly urge all residents/property owners in the town of Bristol to take time to learn about this new methodology, and to let the Focus Panel and the Town Board know how you feel about this topic. If you are not familiar with this new form of drilling, there is a wealth of information on the Internet that is very accessible. We are encouraging all residents to take time to give feedback to the Focus Panel and Bristol Town Board by written submissions emailed to:

*bristolfrackinformation@gmail.com*

To verify residency, please include your name and contact information on your submissions. You may also mail comments to: Town of Bristol, 6740 County Road #32, Canandaigua, New York 14424 Attn: Bristol Frack Information.

On Wednesday, September 26<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 P.M., the Focus Panel will provide an opportunity for the community to attend a forum on High Volume Hydrofracking that will present the panel's research. A survey to collect Bristol residents' feedback will be available at the forum. We strongly encourage all residents to attend.

The Town of Bristol website ([www.townofbristol.org](http://www.townofbristol.org)) will post other regional informational forums as they become available. The listings are intended for educational purposes; however, the views expressed at these meetings do not necessarily represent the viewpoints of the Town of Bristol.

If you would like to voice your opinion in person, please go to the Town of Bristol website for the dates and times of the Town Board Meetings, as well as the Zoning and Planning Board Meetings. Residents are encouraged to attend Bristol town government meetings so as to be informed of the progress of this important decision and the impact it will have on our community.

## **Appendix D**

September 26 Presentation to Bristol Community